P01



Law Offices Of

LALOS & KEEGAN 1146 NINETEENTH STREET, NW FIFTH FLOOR WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3723

(202) 887-5555 FAX: (202) 296-1682 E-mail: laloskeegan@radix.net

	FACSIMILE T	RANSMITTAL SHEET	
TO. Examiner Tariq	Hafiz	PROM: Alfred A.	Stadnicki
COMPANY:		DATE:	TIME: 430 PM
Patent & Trademark Office		10/16/01	1007 Am
PAX NUMBER: 703/3 08/9051 74	16-7238	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INC	LUDING COVER
YOUR REF. 09/010,193		OUR REF: 3350-04	
☐ URGENT ☐ FOR RE	VIEW PLEASE (COMMENT	PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTICE

The document(s) accompanying this facsimite trensmission may contain information from the law tirm of Lales & Keegan that is confidential or privileged or is protected by law as anormey work product or as a trade secret. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual to whom or the entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, or agent responsible for delivering the message to the addressee, please be advised that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us by calling (202) 887-5555. 10/17/01

Docket No.: 3350-04 Client No.: RPP-4 PATENT

#31

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

;

GARRISON et al.

: Group Art Unit: 2765

Serial No. 09/010,193

: Examiner: Romain Jeanty

Filed: January 21, 1998

•

For: DUAL SOURCE REMITTANCE PROCESSING

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW AFTER FINAL

Honorable Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231 I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being sent via facsimile addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231

ulate

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$.

REMARKS

The following summarizes the substance of the Interview on October 16, 2001.

Applicants' representatives pointed out differences between Chang and the invention. The Supervisory Examiner disagreed on the basis that Chang, as construed by the Supervisory Examiner, discloses all of the requests from the multiple payors 202 are from a single source. However, Applicants' representatives noted that if all of the requests from the multiple payors 202 were construed to be from a single source, the applied art would lack the plurality of independent sources required in claim 1. After the Supervisory Examiner indicated that no agreement would be reached on claim 1, Applicants' representative requested a discussion of independent claim 35. The Supervisory Examiner

10:08

Docket No.: 3350-04 Client No.: RPP-4 PATENT

refused to discuss any other claims on the basis that no agenda However, it was pointed out that claim 35 had been provided. had been noted in the prior telephone discussion between the Supervisory Examiner and the Applicants' representatives, that no agenda, written or otherwise, had been requested. In any event, the Supervisory Examiner indicated that unprepared to discuss any claim other than claim 1, although detailed arguments traversing the final rejection of independent claims 19, 35, 41 and 50 as well as numerous dependent claims, had been previously submitted in a Request for Reconsideration. Although the Supervisory Examiner indicates in the Examiner's Interview Summary that "it is best to reschedule the Interview to discuss other issues", the Supervisory Examiner verbally indicated that it was unlikely that this would result in any change in the position set forth in the final Official Action.

> Respectfully submitted, Lalos & Keegan

Alfred A. Stadnicki

Registration No. 30,226

AAS/led 1146 Nineteenth Street, NW Fifth Floor Washington, D.C. 20036-3703 Telephone (202)887-5555 Facsimile (202)296-1682 Date: October 16, 2001